

Remarks/Arguments

This invention relates to a method and apparatus for transmitting programs with multicast addresses to a receiver, in which the receiver performs minimum processing. The Applicants submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, taken either singly or in combination, affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

Cited US Patent 6,781,601 to Cheung, discloses an arrangement in which an input may contain multiple programs. The reference first determines if a first program identification is acceptable, and then assigns a second program identification or tag which determines the type of processing which is needed. Nowhere does the reference show or suggest:

"means for encapsulating the real time protocol data flow into one or more internet protocol packets with corresponding multicast addresses",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Rather, Cheung shows only a transport processor 300 which may filter multicast addresses 24 and 40. It is therefore clear that Cheung does not affect the patentability of Claim 1.

Nowhere does Cheung show or suggest a mobile terminal comprising:

"a means for extracting a multicast address; and

a means for receiving a transmission stream associated with a multicast address",

as specifically set forth in Claim 10. It is therefore clear that Cheung does not affect the patentability of Claim 10.

Similarly, nowhere does Cheung show or suggest:

"encapsulating the real time protocol data flow into internet protocol packets with a multicast address",

as specifically recited in Claim 12. It is therefore clear that Cheung does not affect the patentability of Claim 12.

Similarly, nowhere does Cheung show or suggest:

"extracting a multicast address", and

assembling a video program associated with the multicast address",

as specifically recited in Claim 13. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 13 is not affected by Cheung.

Similarly, nowhere does Cheung show or suggest:

"receiving packets associated with at least one multicasting internet protocol address...and

a means for extracting a multicast address; and

a means for receiving a transmission stream associated with the multicast address",

as specifically recited in Claim 14. It is therefore clear that Claim 14 is not affected by Cheung.

Similarly, nowhere does Cheung show or suggest:

"encapsulating the real time protocol data flow into one or more internet protocol packets with corresponding multicast addresses",

as specifically recited in Claim 22. It is therefore clear that Claim 22 is not affected by Cheung.

Similarly, nowhere does Cheung show or suggest:

"means for encapsulating the real time protocol data flow into one or more internet protocol packets with corresponding multicast addresses",

as specifically recited in Claim 23. It is therefore clear that claim 23 is not affected by Cheung.

The Examiner has also cited US Patent 5,856,973 to Thompson. This patent relates to a method for multiplexing private data with MPEG-2 video and audio data. Private data is either added to packet headers, or is multiplexed with packets of encoded audio or video data. If the subject matter of Thompson were to be added to the subject matter of Cheung, the combination would allow Cheung to add private data to one or more of the multiple programs. However, nowhere would the combination show or suggest the claimed invention. It is therefore clear that Thompson does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has also cited US published application 2004/0052275, to Murakami et al. Murakami et al relates to a recording apparatus in which a gap between audio and video signals is compensated by replacing the audio packet at the start of a following stream with a null packet, and adding soundless audio packets to the end of the preceding stream, so as to eliminate a gap between the audio and video playback times in both streams. A combination of Murakami et al with Cheung would allow Cheung to eliminate a gap between audio and video portions of the signal of Cheung. However, nowhere would the combination affect the patentability of the claimed invention. It is therefore clear that Murakami et al does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has additionally cited US published application 2002/0068,584 to Gage et al. This publication relates to a method of locating

a moving mobile device, in which network mapping tables are revised to correspond to the device location, so as to maintain a high speed connection. The method uses GPS data to locate the mobile device. If the method of Gage et al were to be used with Cheung, the receiver of the input sources would have the ability to be moving. However nowhere would the combination affect the patentability of the claimed invention. It is therefore clear that Gage et al., taken either separately or in combination with the other cited references, does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has additionally cited US published application 2004/0131060, which corresponds to US patent 7,023,813 to Newberg et al. Newberg et al. relates to a method for managing a pool of multicast addresses for call control. Newberg et al discloses multicasting and a WLAN. Nowhere does Newberg et al show or suggest any encapsulation with multicast addresses, or means for extracting multi-cast addresses and for receiving a transmission stream associated with a multi-cast address. If the group communication of Newberg et al were to be used with Cheung, Chung would have the ability to access a group entity. Nowhere would the combination affect the patentability of the claimed invention. It is therefore clear that Newberg et al., taken either separately or in combination with the other cited references, does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has additionally cited US published application 2002/0085585, to Tzeng. Tzeng relates to network switching, such as an Ethernet. The network has a plurality of ports. A switch controlled by a CPU directs data between the ports, depending on the network addresses. If Tseng were to be used with Cheung, Chung would be able to access multiple ports of a network. Nowhere would the combination affect the patentability of the claimed invention. It is therefore clear that Tzeng, taken either separately or in combination with the other cited references, does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

The Examiner has additionally cited US published application 2002/0194606 to Tucker et al. Tucker et al relates to a system for communicating between video conferencing and a computer. The reference reassembles audio and video data of a video conference into standard computer format using new headers. Nowhere does the reference show or suggest any encapsulation with multi-cast addresses, means for extracting multi-cast addresses and for receiving a transmission stream associated with a multicast address. It is therefore clear that Tucker et al, taken either singly or in combination with the other cited references, does not affect the patentability of the claimed invention.

Claims 2 to 7 and 18 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claim 11 is dependent from Claim 10 and adds a further advantageous feature. The Applicants submit that Claim 11 is patentable as its parent Claim 10.

Claim 19 is dependent from Claim 12 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 19 is patentable as its parent Claim 12.

Claim 20 is dependent from Claim 13 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 20 is patentable as its parent Claim 13.

Claim 21 is dependent from Claim 14 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that Claim 21 is patentable as its parent Claim 14.

The Applicants note, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 8, 9, 16 and 17. The Applicants submit that all of the other pending claims are patentable as well.

The Applicants therefore submit that the instant application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Charles Chuanming Wang et al

By: /Daniel E. Sragow/
Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney
Reg. No. 22,856

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
Date: 23 01 2009